

UPDATED

Version Attached

b6 -2

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
 Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2010 8:27 AM
 To: [REDACTED]
 Subject: updated draft
 Attachments: Vandegrift FBI Jan 2010 B.doc

b6 -2

b6 -2

Attached is the latest draft of my entry for the *Encyclopedia on Biodefense*. As I mentioned a couple of weeks ago, ALL my sources are open source. For the Laboratory Division section and its associated programs, I received input from [REDACTED]. For a description of the Intelligence Section embedded w/in the WMDD, I received the OK from [REDACTED]. I asked the WMDD's AD Sr. Policy Advisor to review the draft and he made a couple of comments of wh/I incorporated the changes to the attached draft. The Sr. Policy Advisor is [REDACTED].

b6 -2
b7E -7

I still need to "Blue Book" my cites wh/is the proper format for legal citations but that should not have an impact on the review of the substantive material in the draft.

The following is the by-line I drafted for the entry:

Serina N. Vandegrift addresses Weapons of Mass Destruction policy issues at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Headquarters. [emphasis added] Ms. Vandegrift [REDACTED]

b6 -2

[REDACTED] The views, opinions, and research herein represent the product of the author only.

[REDACTED] told me that she thought it was inappropriate that I "put yourself out there as [REDACTED] when you are not." I told her I disagreed and requested she clarify how I had done so. She stated my by-line "makes you out to be [REDACTED] and again, you are not." She told me she forwarded my by-line to an ethics person in OIC b/c I put myself out there as [REDACTED]. I do not know who the ethics person is and I have not heard from anyone. I do not believe the by-line can be construed that I am holding myself out to be a [REDACTED]. I am [REDACTED].

b6 -2

[REDACTED] I think stating that I "address WMDD policy issues at the Federal level" clearly sets forth my work position at the FBI. I never use the term [REDACTED]. Prior to submission, I reviewed my by-line w/a few colleagues at the office to avoid issues such as this.

I am confused by the process. I thought my supervisor [REDACTED] is supposed to review my draft for any information that may be classified. Instead, my draft is forwarded to [REDACTED] who reviews it and then tells me it is not w/in her jurisdiction to do so and does not offer feedback w/r/t the inaccuracies she verbally told me are present. She states she forwarded my draft to OGC and OIC (ethics) and that I need to wait to hear back from pre-pub after OGC has reviewed it. She also stated that the WMDD Front Office needs to approve the draft. However, your office has not reached out to any offices, that I know of. W/all due respect, this seems like a lot of approvals for an entry that is a personal product ... one that includes a disclaimer in the by-line. I searched the RMD website for guidance w/r/t the approval process. I want to follow procedure and correct/amend my material as necessary but at the same time, I do not want to delay my submission to the publisher.

b6 -2

Any guidance you can provide is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
 Serina

PREPUB-6063

1/21/2010

259A-HQ-C/629046-167

Serina N. Vandegrift. 



b6 -2
b7E -4

[REDACTED]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2010 4:29 PM

b6 -2

To: [REDACTED]**Cc:** [REDACTED] Vandegrift, Serina N.**Subject:** Re: FYI

Thanks [REDACTED] I am cc'ing [REDACTED] from the pre-pub unit b/c I think there is some confusion as to everyone's role in a personal non-work product review. Hopefully [REDACTED] can clarify. It was my understanding from [REDACTED] email to you that my supervisor is to review a personal work product and indicate whether any classified information is revealed ... not to assess the quality or content of the document but look for classified info. It sounds like you are shepherding it through offices I don't believe need to be involved per [REDACTED] email. If it makes you feel more comfortable, that's fine but I did not get that as part of the review process in my communications w [REDACTED]. To my knowledge, her office was not involving OGC. Since [REDACTED] had not contacted OGC can you let us know who the OGC POC is. I asked [REDACTED] who she sent my material to (b/c she stated the review was "outside" her jurisdiction even though she reviewed it per your request) and she said I have to go through pre-pub to get that. That will be difficult to do if pre-pub was not involved in that communication. Also, I don't know why the Front Office needs to review per [REDACTED] verbal statement, if this is a personal work product. One would think a review of non-classified material does not need to go to the DAD level. At this point I am asking [REDACTED] to clarify the procedure b/c it sounds as though we make be creating unnecessary work/reviews for a non-work related product.

b6 -2

Thanks,
Serina

From: [REDACTED]**To:** Vandegrift, Serina N.**Cc:** [REDACTED]**Sent:** Wed Jan 20 16:08:58 2010**Subject:** RE: FYI

b6 -2

Serina I am not involved in this publication or the review process as this is not a Unit or Directorate assignment. This is something you have undertaken on your own. I have no problem with you doing that, but my role as [REDACTED] is simply to pass it through the appropriate bureau channels to pre-publication and OGC and who else they want to review. I can not get involved in the approval process other than approving it to the point that I pass it along in the process. I do not think it rises to the level of an ethics violation unless you publish it that way. This is the ethics review where they point out what if anything should be changed to prevent an ethics issue. I don't think it's a big deal-and certainly not one at this stage of the game. Thanks for keeping me informed. /

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4**From:** Vandegrift, Serina N.**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2010 2:03 PM**To:** [REDACTED]**Subject:** FYI

b6 -2

1/21/2010

PREPUB-6065

[redacted]

b6 -2

I am bringing this to your attention if in the event it becomes an issue. When I spoke w [redacted] last week about my writing material, she told me that she thought it was inappropriate that I "put yourself out there as [redacted] when you are not." I told her I disagreed and requested she clarify how I had done so. She stated my by-line "makes you out to be [redacted] and you are not." She told me she forwarded my by-line to an ethics person in OIC. I do not know who the ethics person is and I have not heard from anyone. I do not believe the by-line can be construed that I am holding myself out to be [redacted]. The following is what it said: *Serina N. Vandegrift addresses Weapons of Mass Destruction policy issues at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Headquarters.*

b6 -2

In any event, the following is the description of [redacted] that is advertised on USAJOBS. This is essentially my current job description. Please pay particular attention to the first line. Even if I wanted to refer to myself as [redacted] it should not pose a problem.

b6 -2

[redacted]

Again, this is just an FYI if additional action is taken and someone believes I committed an ethics violation.

Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift [redacted]

[redacted]

b6 -2
b7E -4

[redacted]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2010 10:39 AM
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Encyclopedia Entry
Attachments: Encyclopediaentry.wpd

b6 -2

[redacted]

I am forwarding an email and attachment I received from the Lab Division that I used as information to include in the Lab section of the manuscript. Since HMRU had recently [redacted] and information was not available on the web, I asked [redacted] to assist me w/information. Also, I am also forwarding an email I rec'd from [redacted] in CBRNSU regarding that unit's activities.

b6 -2
b7E -7

I thought this information may be helpful in your review.

Sincerely,
Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift, [redacted]

[redacted]

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2009 2:18 PM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Encyclopedia Entry

b6 -2

Hi Serina. Please see the attached encyclopedia entry.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

[redacted]

b6 -2

The Hazardous Materials Response Program was established in the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Laboratory Division in 1996, and resulted in the creation of the Hazardous Materials Response Unit (HMRU). The mission of HMRU is to provide scientific, technical and forensic support to FBI Offices investigating crimes involving the actual or threatened use of any hazardous material, including Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). This is accomplished through scientific and technical consultation and/or response on hazardous materials/WMD investigative matters; training, equipping and supporting the FBI's Hazardous Materials Response Teams; supporting National Security Special Events and FBI Special Events; liaison and training with the public safety, scientific, and international communities; and internal preparation and training.

The HMRU was divided into three separate units in July 2009. The Units and their specific missions are as follows:

The Hazardous Materials Response Team Unit (HMRTU) provides forensic and command and control/incident command system (ICS) expertise in support of FBI criminal and intelligence investigations involving the actual or threatened use of any hazardous material, including Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear. HMRTU personnel consult and/or respond on hazardous materials/CBRN. investigative matters; train and support the FBI's 27 Hazardous Materials Response Teams (HMRTs) throughout the country; support National Security Special Events and FBI Special Events; and conduct liaison and training with law enforcement, forensic, and international communities.

The Hazardous Materials Science Response Unit (HMSRU) provides scientific, technical and forensic support of FBI criminal and intelligence investigations involving the actual or threatened use of any hazardous material, including weapons of mass destruction (WMD). This is accomplished through scientific and technical consultation and/or response on hazardous materials/WMD investigative matters, as well as liaison and training with public health, intelligence, scientific, and international communities.

The Hazardous Materials Operations Unit (HMOU) provides advanced hazardous materials (HazMat) and technological hazard response services/capabilities to the FBI and interagency partners to support investigative and intelligence priorities through on-site crime scene operations, HazMat/Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) logistical support, high hazard crime scene safety, HazMat/WMD training, mission planning, interagency and state/local liaison, and infrastructure support to the overall FBI HazMat Response Program.

Supervisory Special Agents and Professional Support personnel are assigned to the above units.

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2010 10:40 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Bio forensics

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

Per my last email, this is CBRNSU's contribution.

Sincerely,
Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift [REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 7:07 PM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Bio forensics

b6 -2
b7E -4

Serina,

Please let me know if this meets your needs

b7E -7

[REDACTED]

I appologize for the delay

Regards

[REDACTED]

b6 -2

1/25/2010

PREPUB-6069



b6 -2

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 3:33 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Bio forensics

b6 -2

Thank you.

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED]
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thu Oct 15 12:04:03 2009
Subject: Re: Bio forensics

b6 -2

I will but it together tonight. I am on travel in [REDACTED] now. Sorry for the delay.

b6 -2

Regards



b6 -2

----- Original Message -----

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wed Oct 14 17:26:52 2009
Subject: Bio forensics

b6 -2

Hi [REDACTED]

b6 -2

Are you able to provide me w/a paragraph or a few sentences on the Bureau's bio forensics program or it's bio forensics activities? I am under deadline and wanted to double check w/you as to whether I should expect a very short write-up.

Thank you,
Serina

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

From: Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 8:29 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: Re: manuscript review

My bad. I was driving when I sent out the other response. I would like until Monday to finish my review and provide any comments. First read looks good though.

Doug
 Doug Perdue

b6 -2

From: Perdue, Gary D.
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thu Feb 04 06:24:13 2010
Subject: Re: manuscript review

b6 -2

I am good with this and have no issues
 Doug Perdue

b6 -2

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.; Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Thu Feb 04 06:21:34 2010
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

Good morning [REDACTED]

b6 -2

I appreciate your assistance in this matter. I will be looking forward to hearing from SC Perdue.

Thank you

b6 -2

[REDACTED]
 Prepublication Review Office
 Record Management Division
 170 Marcel Drive, Room O-03
 Winchester, VA 22602-4843
 (540) 868-1697

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 03, 2010 4:29 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.; Perdue, Gary D. [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: manuscript review

b6 -2

[REDACTED] I have reviewed the document again thoroughly and I do not have any issues with it from the standpoints you

b6 -2

2/4/2010

PREPUB-6071

requested on Monday. It contains no law enforcement sensitive information, techniques or procedures and there is nothing classified in this document. WMDD AD Majidi has also reviewed the document and has no issues with it. The AD did ask WMDD SC Gary D. Perdue to also review same. Once SC Perdue has concluded his review it is good to go. Thanks you for your assistance with this project. The WMD Directorate appreciates it and your efforts on our behalf.

Doug-please reply directly back to [redacted] once you are done. Thanks-

b6 -2

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 4:23 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: manuscript

b6 -2



b6 -2

Per your 1:14 email on FBINET, attached is the most recent draft of the manuscript. [redacted] and I went through the document and he advised I make the following change: where I state the FBI is the lead agency ... "for managing the interagency response to an incident" I should change it to "managing the law enforcement and investigative response to an incident." The former quote is directly from FBI and DOJ websites, however [redacted] told me that he has told Dr. Majidi those statements are incorrect now that DHS has a coordinating role and that "to be safe" and address your concerns, I should change it to the latter quote even if the FBI website does not change it.

b6 -2

In late Summer / early Fall [redacted] from CBRNSU provided me language w/r/t that unit and the bioforensics program, w/then [redacted] approval. I also received written descriptions from [redacted] w/r/t their respective units since that information was not available on the web due to the very recent division of HMRU. Lastly, I received verbal approval from [redacted] who was [redacted] at the time I approached him, w/r/t the description of the Intel Section. I have the emails and notes of my interactions w/each of these individuals if you need them to make sure nothing comes back to you. All other information is available on the web, including everything I stated w/r/t CJIS's role.

b6 -2

Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift, [redacted]

b6 -2
b7E -4

[redacted]

From: Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 6:24 AM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: Re: manuscript review

b6 -2

I am good with this and have no issues
Doug Perdue

b6 -2

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.; Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Thu Feb 04 06:21:34 2010
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

Good morning [redacted]

b6 -2

I appreciate your assistance in this matter. I will be looking forward to hearing from SC Perdue.

Thank you

b6 -2

[redacted]
Prepublication Review Office
Record Management Division
170 Marcel Drive, Room O-03
Winchester, VA 22602-4843
(540) 868-1697

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, February 03, 2010 4:29 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.; Perdue, Gary D. [redacted]
Subject: FW: manuscript review

b6 -2

[redacted] I have reviewed the document again thoroughly and I do not have any issues with it from the standpoints you requested on Monday. It contains no law enforcement sensitive information, techniques or procedures and there is nothing classified in this document. WMDD AD Majidi has also reviewed the document and has no issues with it. The AD did ask WMDD SC Gary D. Perdue to also review same. Once SC Perdue has concluded his review it is good to go. Thanks you for your assistance with this project. The WMD Directorate appreciates it and your efforts on our behalf.

b6 -2

Doug-please reply directly back to [redacted] once you are done. Thanks-

b6 -2

b6 -2
b7E -4

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 4:23 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: manuscript

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

Per your 1:14 email on FBINET, attached is the most recent draft of the manuscript. [REDACTED] and I went through the document and he advised I make the following change: where I state the FBI is the lead agency ... "for managing the interagency response to an incident" I should change it to "managing the law enforcement and investigative response to an incident." The former quote is directly from FBI and DOJ websites, however [REDACTED] told me that he has told Dr. Majidi those statements are incorrect now that DHS has a coordinating role and that "to be safe" and address your concerns, I should change it to the latter quote even if the FBI website does not change it.

b6 -2

In late Summer / early Fall [REDACTED] from CBRNSU provided me language w/r/t that unit and the bioforensics program, w/then [REDACTED] approval. I also received written descriptions from [REDACTED] w/r/t their respective units since that information was not available on the web due to the very recent division of HMRU. Lastly, I received verbal approval from [REDACTED] who was [REDACTED] at the time I approached him, w/r/t the description of the Intel Section. I have the emails and notes of my interactions w/each of these individuals if you need them to make sure nothing comes back to you. All other information is available on the web, including everything I stated w/r/t CJIS's role.

b6 -2

Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4

b6 -2

[redacted]
From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 6:22 AM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.; Perdue, Gary D.
Subject: RE: manuscript review

Good morning [redacted]

b6 -2

I appreciate your assistance in this matter. I will be looking forward to hearing from SC Perdue.

Thank you

b6 -2

[redacted]
Prepublication Review Office
Record Management Division
170 Marcel Drive, Room O-03
Winchester, VA 22602-4843
(540) 868-1697

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, February 03, 2010 4:29 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.; Perdue, [redacted]
Subject: FW: manuscript review

b6 -2

[redacted] I have reviewed the document again thoroughly and I do not have any issues with it from the standpoints you requested on Monday. It contains no law enforcement sensitive information, techniques or procedures and there is nothing classified in this document. WMDD AD Majidi has also reviewed the document and has no issues with it. The AD did ask WMDD SC Gary D. Perdue to also review same. Once SC Perdue has concluded his review it is good to go. Thanks you for your assistance with this project. The WMD Directorate appreciates it and your efforts on our behalf.

b6 -2

Doug-please reply directly back to [redacted] once you are done. Thanks-

b6 -2

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 4:23 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: manuscript

b6 -2

b6 -2

[redacted]
Per your 1:14 email on FBINET, attached is the most recent draft of the manuscript. [redacted] and I went through the document and he advised I make the following change: where I state the FBI is the lead

2/4/2010

PREPUB-6075

agency ... "for managing the interagency response to an incident" I should change it to "managing the law enforcement and investigative response to an incident." The former quote is directly from FBI and DOJ websites, however, [redacted] told me that he has told Dr. Majidi those statements are incorrect now that DHS has a coordinating role and that "to be safe" and address your concerns, I should change it to the latter quote even if the FBI website does not change it.

b6 -2

In late Summer / early Fall [redacted] from CBRNSU provided me language w/r/t that unit and the bioforensics program, w/then [redacted] approval. I also received written descriptions from [redacted] w/r/t their respective units since that information was not available on the web due to the very recent division of HMRU. Lastly, I received verbal approval from [redacted] who was [redacted] at the time I approached him, w/r/t the description of the Intel Section. I have the emails and notes of my interactions w/each of these individuals if you need them to make sure nothing comes back to you. All other information is available on the web, including everything I stated w/r/t CJIS's role.

b6 -2

Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift. [redacted]

b6 -2
b7E -4

[redacted]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2010 2:23 PM
To: Hardy, David M
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Manuscript

Mr. Hardy:

I am appealing for your assistance on this issue.

I am not in a position to challenge [redacted]. However, I believe there may have been a misunderstanding on [redacted] part with respect to review of personal work products. In her initial email to [redacted] requested a review of my manuscript for any classified information, information pertaining to an open case, etc., per Section 2.4 Prohibited Disclosures of the "Prepublication Review Manual" (Manual) (p. 9).

b6 -2

I understand [redacted] concerns in wanting to protect the FBI's interests and therefore his request of a more thorough review from a number of other entities w/in the Bureau. My concern is that this process is becoming a larger endeavor than need be; the review will be a quality review as opposed to looking for prohibited disclosures; and there will be a delay tactic wh/will result in my not meeting my editors' deadline.

b6 -2

I recently [redacted]

b6 -2

[redacted] I am also "in the dark" with respect to the Directorate's review ... many of my questions over the last few weeks have gone unanswered until today (please see below).

From my conversations w/ [redacted] her office is not in contact w/any of these other offices. I am under the impression [redacted] thinks that the Pre-Pub Unit is shepherding this through a review process or that there is some kind of contact. I also do not think he is cognizant of any timelines/deadlines, even though [redacted] included it in her email.

b6 -2

I submitted the draft manuscript the first week in January w/the assumption that the Manual's general rule of response is "within 30 workdays of receipt." I forwarded a draft on January 4.

It may help if you or [redacted] contact [redacted] especially with respect to a deadline issue. This manuscript is a personal work product and I do not believe any of the individuals [redacted] contacted are going to review this document any time soon. I spoke w/ [redacted] this afternoon and she stated that RMD/Pre-Pub needs to address the deadline issue and not me ... I don't mean to punt it to your office but w/out further guidance or set deadlines from your office, I am at a loss and will not meet my obligations to [redacted].

b6 -2,-3

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift, [redacted]

b6 -2
b7E -4

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2010 1:07 PM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: Re: Manuscript

b6 -2

Yes. [REDACTED] The DAD will also review once it comes back
from pre-pub. [REDACTED]

b6 -2

----- Original Message -----

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Fri Jan 29 10:37:09 2010
Subject: Manuscript

b6 -2

[REDACTED]
Other than [REDACTED] did you forward my manuscript to anyone for review?
Serina

b6 -2

[redacted]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.

Sent: Friday, February 05, 2010 7:44 PM

To: Perdue, Gary D.

Cc: [redacted]

Subject: Re: manuscript review

Thank you. You will be glad to hear my 2 other manuscripts (another chapter for the same encyclopedia but on a different agency and a WMD piece for a Naval War College publication) do not require Bureau review since they do not discuss the Bu and my by-lines do not mention FBI employment. Again, my apologies for temporarily diverting your Section's resources for this review.

Have a great weekend.

Serina

From: Perdue, Gary D.

To: Vandegrift, Serina N. [redacted]

Cc: [redacted]

Sent: Fri Feb 05 19:21:59 2010

Subject: Re: manuscript review

b6 -2

Serina:

Thanks for indulging us on these requested changes.

Although this is a personal product, we all of course want the correct information to go out to the public.

Thanks and have a safe weekend.

Doug
Doug Perdue

b6 -2

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.

To: Perdue, Gary D. [redacted]

Cc: [redacted]

Sent: Fri Feb 05 18:35:04 2010

Subject: Re: manuscript review

b6 -2

Understood. Although these comments do not relate to classified information I can see your point on wanting to protect the Bureau's interests. This is not a work product but a personal product. Nonetheless, I will delete the sentences about [redacted] I will re-write the sentence

regarding [redacted] Is there anything else you would like to see changed?
Serina

b7E -3

From: Perdue, Gary D.

To: Vandegrift, Serina N. [redacted]

Cc: [redacted]

Sent: Fri Feb 05 13:11:48 2010

Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

2/17/2010

PREPUB-6079

Serina:

CPS crew appreciates you accepting the majority of our comments. However, we stand-by our comments that you did not accept. Please try to incorporate the following comments as much as possible:

First comment: [REDACTED]

b7E -3

2nd: [REDACTED]

b7E -3

Last comment: [REDACTED]

b7E -3

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.

To: Perdue, Gary D.

Cc: [REDACTED]

b6 -2

Sent: Thu Feb 04 19:11:36 2010

Subject: RE: manuscript review

Thank you very much for having individuals in your section review the manuscript. Although it was necessary, I am sorry it took time from individuals' official Bureau work. I am glad to see that no classified or non-open source information was divulged. The suggested edits below are very helpful and I accepted/incorporated all but the last suggestion. I included comments (in red) along side each suggested edit to indicate the way in wh/the suggested edit was used. I believe your Section's review made this a better product and more accurately reflects the FBI components involved in biodefense. I appreciate the fact that your section was able to correct inaccuracies that are already in print in the public domain, i.e., Dr. Majidi's comments about WMDC certification. Again, thank you.

Attached is a "clean" final copy that I intend to send to the editor who will subsequently incorporate in the overall manuscript and forward to the publisher on Monday. If you are satisfied w/the changes, could you please let [REDACTED] know so that he may contact [REDACTED] and she can issue the official approval.

b6 -2

Sincerely,
Serina

b7E -3

b7E -3

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 11:57 AM
To: Perdue, Gary D.
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

Thank you very much. It was not my intent to put any pressure ... just wanted to let you know of the final deadline if the FBI was going to be included in the publication.
Again, thank you.
Serina

From: Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 11:36 AM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

Serina:

I did not know about the deadline and just picked Monday out of the air thinking that was reasonable. We will get any additional comments to you and [REDACTED] by tomorrow noon then.

b6 -2

Doug

PREPUB-6081

2/17/2010

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 10:20 AM
To: Perdue, Gary D.
Cc: [REDACTED] Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

I don't have a problem w/that. However, I did mention to the DAD earlier this week that the absolute deadline is Monday and that [REDACTED] stated if it's not received by Monday the FBI entry will not be included in the overall manuscript that is being sent to the publisher. I'm not trying to put pressure on you but I did want to let you know of the editors/publishers deadlines.
Serina

b6 -3

Serina N. Vandegrift [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 8:29 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: Re: manuscript review

b6 -2

My bad. I was driving when I sent out the other response. I would like until Monday to finish my review and provide any comments. First read looks good though.

Doug
Doug Perdue
[REDACTED]

b6 -2

From: Perdue, Gary D.
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thu Feb 04 06:24:13 2010
Subject: Re: manuscript review

b6 -2

I am good with this and have no issues
Doug Perdue
[REDACTED]

b6 -2

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.; Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Thu Feb 04 06:21:34 2010
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

Good morning [REDACTED]

b6 -2

2/17/2010

PREPUB-6082

I appreciate your assistance in this matter. I will be looking forward to hearing from SC Perdue.

Thank you

[REDACTED]
 Prepublication Review Office
 Record Management Division
 170 Marcel Drive, Room O-03
 Winchester, VA 22602-4843
 (540) 868-1697

b6 -2

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 03, 2010 4:29 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.; Perdue, Gary D.; [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: manuscript review

b6 -2

[REDACTED] I have reviewed the document again thoroughly and I do not have any issues with it from the standpoints you requested on Monday. It contains no law enforcement sensitive information, techniques or procedures and there is nothing classified in this document. WMDD AD Majidi has also reviewed the document and has no issues with it. The AD did ask WMDD SC Gary D. Perdue to also review same. Once SC Perdue has concluded his review it is good to go. Thanks you for your assistance with this project. The WMD Directorate appreciates it and your efforts on our behalf.

b6 -2

Doug-please reply directly back to [REDACTED] once you are done. Thanks-

b6 -2



b6 -2
 b7E -4

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 4:23 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: manuscript

b6 -2



b6 -2

Per your 1:14 email on FBINET, attached is the most recent draft of the manuscript. [REDACTED] and I went through the document and he advised I make the following change: where I state the FBI is the lead agency ... "for managing the interagency response to an incident" I should change it to "managing the law enforcement and investigative response to an incident." The former quote is directly from FBI and DOJ websites, however, [REDACTED] told me that he has told Dr. Majidi those statements are incorrect now that DHS has a coordinating role and that "to be safe" and address your concerns, I should change it to the latter quote even if the FBI website does not change it.

b6 -2

In late Summer / early Fall, [REDACTED] from CBRNSU provided me language w/r/t that unit and the bioforensics program, w/then [REDACTED] approval. I also received written descriptions from [REDACTED] w/r/t their respective units since that information was not available on the web due to the very recent division of HMRU. Lastly, I received verbal approval from [REDACTED] who was [REDACTED] at the time I approached him, w/r/t the description of the Intel Section.

b6 -2

I have the emails and notes of my interactions w/each of these individuals if you need them to make sure nothing comes back to you. All other information is available on the web, including everything I stated w/r/t CJIS's role.

Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift. 



b6 -2
b7E -4

b6 -2

[redacted]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2010 12:22 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: manuscript review

b6 -2

[redacted]

My apologies for taking so long to respond - I have been out of the office very ill for several days. If it's not a problem, could you please mail the approval letter to my home mailing address. Again, thank you for all your assistance in this review process.

Sincerely,
Serina

b6 -2

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Wed Feb 17 10:03:18 2010
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

Good morning Ms. Vandegrift,

Thank you for forwarding Mr. Perdue's approval email. The manuscript has been approved. I will be sending you an approval letter. What address do you want the letter sent to?

Thank you

b6 -2

[redacted]

Prepublication Review Office
Record Management Division
170 Marcel Drive, Room O-03
Winchester, VA 22602-4843
(540) 868-1697

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 3:55 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: manuscript review

b6 -2

[redacted]

Below are the approvals from my supervisor and Doug Perdue, the CPS Section Chief. Please let me know if you require additional information.

b6 -2

Thank you,
Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift [redacted]

b6 -2
b7E -4

2/22/2010

PREPUB-6085

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 3:48 PM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Cc: Perdue, Gary D.
Subject: Re: manuscript review

b6 -2

I have already provided my approval to her. She is waiting for Doug's. Simply forwarding his email to her should be sufficient. Thanks.

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Fri Feb 12 15:42:26 2010
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

[REDACTED]
I spoke w/Doug in the hallway earlier this afternoon and he stated his email below is to be read as there are no more edits/suggestions from his section... their review is done. Unless you have any issues, could you please provide your conclusion to [REDACTED] in pre-pub the next time you are in the office so that she can provide me the official documentation to move forward w/the manuscript to the editors/publisher.
Thank you,
Serina

b6 -2

Serina N. Vandegrift, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Friday, February 05, 2010 7:22 PM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: manuscript review

b6 -2

Serina:

Thanks for indulging us on these requested changes.

Although this is a personal product, we all of course want the correct information to go out to the public.

Thanks and have a safe weekend.

Doug
Doug Perdue
[REDACTED]

b6 -2

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
To: Perdue, Gary D.; [REDACTED]

b6 -2

2/22/2010

PREPUB-6086

Cc: [redacted] Vandegrift, Serina 'N.

b6 -2

Sent: Fri Feb 05 18:35:04 2010

Subject: Re: manuscript review

Understood. Although these comments do not relate to classified information I can see your point on wanting to protect the Bureau's interests. This is not a work product but a personal product. Nonetheless, I will delete the sentences about [redacted] I will re-write the sentence

b7E -3

regarding [redacted] Is there anything else you would like to see changed?
Serina

From: Perdue, Gary D.

To: Vandegrift, Serina N. [redacted]

b6 -2

Cc: [redacted]

Sent: Fri Feb 05 13:11:48 2010

Subject: RE: manuscript review

Serina:

CPS crew appreciates you accepting the majority of our comments. However, we stand-by our comments that you did not accept. Please try to incorporate the following comments as much as possible:

First comment: [redacted]

b7E -3

2nd: [redacted]

b7E -3

Last comment: [redacted]

b7E -3

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.

To: Perdue, Gary D.

Cc: [redacted]

b6 -2

Sent: Thu Feb 04 19:11:36 2010

Subject: RE: manuscript review

Thank you very much for having individuals in your section review the manuscript. Although it was necessary, I am sorry it took time from individuals' official Bureau work. I am glad to see that no classified or non-open source information was divulged. The suggested edits below are very helpful and I accepted/incorporated all but the last suggestion. I included comments (in red) along side each suggested edit to indicate the way in wh/the suggested edit was used. I believe your Section's review made this a better product and more accurately reflects the FBI components involved in biodefense. I appreciate the fact that your section was able to correct inaccuracies that are already in print in the public domain, i.e., Dr. Majidi's comments about WMDC certification. Again, thank you.

Attached is a "clean" final copy that I intend to send to the editor who will subsequently incorporate in the overall manuscript and forward to the publisher on Monday. If you are satisfied w/the changes, could you please let [redacted] know so that he may contact [redacted] and she can issue the official approval.

b6 -2

Sincerely,
Serina

2/22/2010

PREPUB-6087

b7E -3

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 11:57 AM
To: Perdue, Gary D.
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

Thank you very much. It was not my intent to put any pressure ... just wanted to let you know of the final deadline if the FBI was going to be included in the publication.

2/22/2010

PREPUB-6088

Again, thank you.
Serina

From: Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 11:36 AM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

Serina:

I did not know about the deadline and just picked Monday out of the air thinking that was reasonable. We will get any additional comments to you and [REDACTED] by tomorrow noon then.

b6 -2

Doug

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 10:20 AM
To: Perdue, Gary D.
Cc: [REDACTED] Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

I don't have a problem w/that. However, I did mention to the DAD earlier this week that the absolute deadline is Monday and that [REDACTED] stated if it's not received by Monday the FBI entry will not be included in the overall manuscript that is being sent to the publisher. I'm not trying to put pressure on you but I did want to let you know of the editors/publishers deadlines.

b6 -3

Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift, [REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: Perdue, Gary D.
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 8:29 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: Re: manuscript review

b6 -2

My bad. I was driving when I sent out the other response. I would like until Monday to finish my review and provide any comments. First read looks good though.

Doug
Doug Perdue

b6 -2

From: Perdue, Gary D.
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thu Feb 04 06:24:13 2010

b6 -2

2/22/2010

PREPUB-6089

Subject: Re: manuscript review

I am good with this and have no issues
Doug Perdue

[REDACTED]

b6 -2

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.; Perdue, Gary D.

Sent: Thu Feb 04 06:21:34 2010

Subject: RE: manuscript review

b6 -2

Good morning [REDACTED]

b6 -2

I appreciate your assistance in this matter. I will be looking forward to hearing from SC Perdue.

Thank you

[REDACTED]

b6 -2

Prepublication Review Office
Record Management Division
170 Marcel Drive, Room O-03
Winchester, VA 22602-4843
(540) 868-1697

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, February 03, 2010 4:29 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.; Perdue, Gary D. [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: manuscript review

b6 -2

[REDACTED] I have reviewed the document again thoroughly and I do not have any issues with it from the standpoints you requested on Monday. It contains no law enforcement sensitive information, techniques or procedures and there is nothing classified in this document. WMDD AD Majidi has also reviewed the document and has no issues with it. The AD did ask WMDD SC Gary D. Perdue to also review same. Once SC Perdue has concluded his review it is good to go. Thanks you for your assistance with this project. The WMD Directorate appreciates it and your efforts on our behalf.

b6 -2

Doug-please reply directly back to [REDACTED] once you are done. Thanks-

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.

Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 4:23 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: manuscript

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

2/22/2010

PREPUB-6090

Per your 1:14 email on FBINET, attached is the most recent draft of the manuscript. [redacted] and I went through the document and he advised I make the following change: where I state the FBI is the lead agency ... "for managing the interagency response to an incident" I should change it to "managing the law enforcement and investigative response to an incident." The former quote is directly from FBI and DOJ websites, however [redacted] told me that he has told Dr. Majidi those statements are incorrect now that DHS has a coordinating role and that "to be safe" and address your concerns, I should change it to the latter quote even if the FBI website does not change it.

b6 -2

In late Summer / early Fall, [redacted] from CBRNSU provided me language w/r/t that unit and the bioforensics program, w/their [redacted] approval. I also received written descriptions from [redacted] w/r/t their respective units since that information was not available on the web due to the very recent division of HMRU. Lastly, I received verbal approval from [redacted] who was [redacted] at the time I approached him, w/r/t the description of the Intel Section. I have the emails and notes of my interactions w/each of these individuals if you need them to make sure nothing comes back to you. All other information is available on the web, including everything I stated w/r/t CJIS's role.

b6 -2

Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift. [redacted]

b6 -2
b7E -4

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 6:02 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: publication draft
Importance: High
Attachments: Vandegrift FBI 2009.doc

Hello [REDACTED]

b6 -2

Thank you for returning my call last week. I was asked to write a chapter on FBI's role in biodefense for the Encyclopedia of Bioterrorism Defense. Attached, please find a draft copy of my contribution. The content is fact-based and not opinions. Additionally, all the material was obtained from open source materials.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best regards,
Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4

[redacted]

From: [redacted]

Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2010 3:31 PM

b6 -2

To: [redacted]

Cc: [redacted]

Subject: FW: Prepublication Review Office

[redacted] please find attached a draft manuscript from Serina Vandegrift that she has submitted for publication. As per the RMD email below would you review the document for publication within the guidelines set by RMD. Please note the 30 day deadline. Thank you. /

b6 -2

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: [redacted]

b6 -2

Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2010 2:29 PM

To: [redacted]

Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.

Subject: Prepublication Review Office

Good afternoon [redacted]

b6 -2

I am [redacted] Coordinator of the Prepublication Review Office (Records Management Division). My office's function is to review intended publications by current/former FBI employees to determine if the employee has included information obtained during FBI employment, which should not otherwise be released. Examples would be classified information, Rule 6e, sensitive techniques, pending investigations or prosecutions, personal privacy info, FBI information not available to the general public through means such as FOIPA, the media or court records, etc.

b6 -2

As is more common than not it is necessary that we call upon FBI "subject matter experts" to review the submissions of current/former FBI employees as the subject matter at issue is beyond the general expertise of my employees. It is in this regard, that I am contacting you.

Would you please have someone in your office review the manuscript from Serina Vandegrift (FBI-Weapons of Mass Destruction Directorate). Ms. Vandegrift has forwarded you her paper in an email on January 5, 2010. Please provide us your conclusions regarding the information in question. Should you have questions, please feel free to call or email me.


General Rule-We have 30 business days to respond to the author. Also, as the material is proprietary information, it is not to be disclosed/shared beyond those persons involved in the review process.

Thank you

b6 -2

1/7/2010

PREPUB-6093


Prepublication Review Office
Record Management Division
170 Marcel Drive, Room O-03
Winchester, VA 22602-4843
(540) 868-1697

b6 -2

[redacted]
From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2010 3:31 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: RE: Prepublication Review Office

10-4, will do.

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2010 2:29 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: Prepublication Review Office

b6 -2

Good afternoon [redacted]

b6 -2

I am [redacted] Coordinator of the Prepublication Review Office (Records Management Division). My office's function is to review intended publications by current/former FBI employees to determine if the employee has included information obtained during FBI employment, which should not otherwise be released. Examples would be classified information, Rule 6e, sensitive techniques, pending investigations or prosecutions, personal privacy info, FBI information not available to the general public through means such as FOIPA, the media or court records, etc.

b6 -2

As is more common, than not it is necessary that we call upon FBI "subject matter experts" to review the submissions of current/former FBI employees as the subject matter at issue is beyond the general expertise of my employees. It is in this regard, that I am contacting you.

Would you please have someone in your office review the manuscript from Serina Vandegrift (FBI-Weapons of Mass Destruction Directorate). Ms. Vandegrift has forwarded you her paper in an email on January 5, 2010. Please provide us your conclusions regarding the information in question. Should you have questions, please feel free to call or email me.

General Rule-We have 30 business days to respond to the author. Also, as the material is proprietary information, it is not to be disclosed/shared beyond those persons involved in the review process.

Thank you

b6 -2

[redacted]
Prepublication Review Office
Record Management Division
170 Marcel Drive, Room O-03
Winchester, VA 22602-4843
(540) 868-1697

1/7/2010

PREPUB-6095

b6 -2

From:**Sent:** Wednesday, January 06, 2010 3:59 PM**To:****Cc:****Subject:** RE: Prepublication Review Office**Attachments:** Vandegrift FBI 2009.doc

Well it works better with the attachment doesn't it! Sorry about that. Here we go-

b6 -2
b7E -4**From:****Sent:** Wednesday, January 06, 2010 3:31 PM**To:****Cc:****Subject:** FW: Prepublication Review Office

b6 -2

please find attached a draft manuscript from Serina Vandegrift that she has submitted for publication. As per the RMD email below would you review the document for publication within the guidelines set by RMD. Please note the 30 day deadline. Thank you. /

b6 -2

b6 -2
b7E -4**From:****Sent:** Wednesday, January 06, 2010 2:29 PM**To:****Cc:** Vandegrift, Serina N.**Subject:** Prepublication Review Office

b6 -2

Good afternoon

b6 -2

I am Coordinator of the Prepublication Review Office (Records Management Division). My office's function is to review intended publications by current/former FBI employees to determine if the employee has included information obtained during FBI employment, which should not otherwise be released. Examples would be classified information, Rule 6e, sensitive techniques, pending investigations or prosecutions, personal privacy info, FBI information not available to the general public

b6 -2

PREPUB-6096

1/7/2010

through means such as FOIPA, the media or court records, etc.

As is more common than not it is necessary that we call upon FBI "subject matter experts" to review the submissions of current/former FBI employees as the subject matter at issue is beyond the general expertise of my employees. It is in this regard, that I am contacting you.

Would you please have someone in your office review the manuscript from Serina Vandegrift (FBI- Weapons of Mass Destruction Directorate). Ms. Vandegrift has forwarded you her paper in an email on January 5, 2010. Please provide us your conclusions regarding the information in question. Should you have questions, please feel free to call or email me.

General Rule-We have 30 business days to respond to the author. Also, as the material is proprietary information, it is not to be disclosed/shared beyond those persons involved in the review process.

Thank you

b6 -2

Prepublication Review Office
Record Management Division
170 Marcel Drive, Room O-03
Winchester, VA 22602-4843
(540) 868-1697

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2010 10:38 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Resume Followup

b6 -1

b6 -2

Thank you for the letter [REDACTED]

b6 -2

Best of wishes in 2010!

Cheers,
[REDACTED]

b6 -1

****PROPRIETARY & COMPANY-CONFIDENTIAL****

This email and the contents of this email (including any attachments) are company-~~confidential~~ and/or proprietary. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy, disclose or distribute this email or any of the contents of this email. If you received this email in error, please promptly notify the sender by reply email and delete this email from your records. Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tue 2009-10-13 13:07
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Resume Followup

b6 -1, -2

Hello [REDACTED]

b6 -1

Yes, your resume has been approved. I will be sending you an approval letter. Please provide me an address where you want the letter sent.

Thank you
[REDACTED]

b6 -2

Prepublication Review Office
540-868-1697

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 10:17 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Resume Followup

b6 -1, -2

Hello [REDACTED]

b6 -2

I received an email from [REDACTED] stating that he didn't see any opsec concerns regarding my resume, but I was still waiting on the confirmation from you. Could you please confirm whether or not I'm cleared to release my resume?

b6 -3

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

b6 -1

****PROPRIETARY & COMPANY-CONFIDENTIAL****

This email and the contents of this email (including any attachments) are company-~~confidential~~ and/or proprietary. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy, disclose or distribute this email or any of the contents of this email. If you received this email in error, please promptly notify the sender by reply email and delete this email from your records. Thank you.

b6 -2

[redacted]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 4:56 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: RE: Prepublication Review Office

b6 -2

[redacted]

This email is a follow up to my response to [redacted] of OGC. Apparently my manuscript has created several issues. I would like to propose the following: 1) I remove any mention of my FBI employment in the manuscript by-line, and 2) I mail you **hard copies of all my sources**.

b6 -2

ALL my material was obtained from open source information, primarily US government websites. If the government sites publish incorrect information, that is not something I should be checking, double checking, and triple checking and/or correct. Each department/agency has its own fact checkers. One of my sources is the Assistant Director's, Dr. Majidi, contribution to a Symposium. (Majidi, Vahid. Unrestricted Warfare -- Senior Perspectives. Chapter, 2009 Unrestricted Warfare Symposium. The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory. 447-53) I reviewed his material w/a colleague in my unit who stated he believes Dr. Majidi may have misspoken/misstated a fact I cited w/in his work. That is something out of my control. I can only cite what is officially out there in the public domain. Additionally, Dr. Majidi has made comments during staff mtgs stating Bureau material on the web is outdated and needs to be revised. An author cannot wait until a department/agency revises its publication material ... he/she depends/relies on what is legitimately and credibly available in the public domain.

Again, ALL of my material can be found on the web and to save you some time and research, I can provide you hard copies from wh/to verify my work.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
 Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift [redacted]

[redacted]

b6 -2
 b7E -4

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2010 2:29 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: Prepublication Review Office

b6 -2

Good afternoon [redacted]

b6 -2

I am [redacted] Coordinator of the Prepublication Review Office (Records Management Division). My office's function is to review intended publications by current/former FBI employees to determine if the employee has included information obtained during FBI employment, which should not otherwise be released. Examples would be classified information, Rule 6e, sensitive techniques, pending

b6 -2

1/19/2010

PREPUB-6099

investigations or prosecutions, personal privacy info, FBI information not available to the general public through means such as FOIPA, the media or court records, etc.

As is more common than not it is necessary that we call upon FBI "subject matter experts" to review the submissions of current/former FBI employees as the subject matter at issue is beyond the general expertise of my employees. It is in this regard, that I am contacting you.

Would you please have someone in your office review the manuscript from Serina Vandegrift (FBI- Weapons of Mass Destruction Directorate). Ms. Vandegrift has forwarded you her paper in an email on January 5, 2010. Please provide us your conclusions regarding the information in question. Should you have questions, please feel free to call or email me.

General Rule-We have 30 business days to respond to the author. Also, as the material is proprietary information, it is not to be disclosed/shared beyond those persons involved in the review process.

Thank you

b6 -2

Prepublication Review Office
Record Management Division
170 Marcel Drive, Room O-03
Winchester, VA 22602-4843
(540) 868-1697

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 4:46 PM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

Correct—RMD is your POC for this. OGC may be consulted by RMD if there are particular legal issues, but OGC does not normally do substantive legal review of personal publications.

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 4:42 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

I did misunderstand you earlier this morning when I came by your office. I thought you stated you looked at the document and that you had sent it to OGC for review as part of the pre-pub process. My misunderstanding led me to believe there is an entity in OGC that reviews personal publications and renders an opinion to RMD pre-pub. What I understand you are saying now is that OGC does not have a role since this is a personal publication and RMD conducts this pre-pub review process. I will follow up w/RMD.
 Thanks,
 Serina

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 4:23 PM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

Per email below, OGC does NOT conduct a substantive legal review of personal publications. There is no OGC point of contact for this. Your POC is RMD, which is facilitating the prepublication review process.

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 4:21 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N. [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

Thank you [REDACTED] Unless I misunderstood you earlier today, OGC is conducting the substantive legal review. Are you able to provide me the OGC POC?
 Serina

b6 -2

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 8:24 AM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N. [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

Serina, per our discussion, I have already talked to [REDACTED] in connection with the official prepub review process. While OGC does substantive legal review and provides comments for official FBI products, it is really outside my lane to be doing legal editing for personal publications. I would suggest generally that you double check your citations and legal research though, as I'm sure you will do anyway in the final editing process with your publisher, assuming that the Bureau clears this through the prepub review. RMD should be getting back to you with the official Bureau comments. Thanks.

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

b6 -2

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 8:02 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

Thanks for the update [REDACTED]

b6 -2

[REDACTED]
 ALL the information came from open source materials. The drafts I sent you earlier this morning have better citations for follow up. I look forward to OGC's comments, especially the CJIS issue considering I did not write anything that is not already public. Additionally, I have no problem removing my FBI affiliation in the by-line if that poses a problem or angst w/in the Bureau.

Thanks,
 Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6 -2
 b7E -4

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 7:25 AM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

I had already sent it to [REDACTED] who is currently pushing it through the OGC channels. There are several issues with it already-but they will make a final report and recommendation then it will go to the front office for review because you cite your employment in your by-line. CJIS has several issues including one that they do not want made public. The review process is currently ongoing. /

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

b6 -2
 b7E -4

b6 -2
b7E -4

[REDACTED]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 7:19 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: FW: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

In Spring 2009, I was asked to write the FDA and FBI entries for the 3rd edition to the *Encyclopedia of Bioterrorism Defense*. This project was not part of my FBI duties nor did I work on these writings while "on the job." However, b/c I am an FBI employee and am writing on FBI's activities, I have to get my entries reviewed. I contacted the RMD pre-pub unit to for guidance and the representative stated that I just needed my supervisor's approval. However, I think [REDACTED] would feel more comfortable if I ran this by the 2 of you in your capacities as [REDACTED]

b6 -2

Everything I wrote is fact-based, not opinion. All the material was obtained from open sources and I have printed copies of my references. W/r/t the Lab Division, I received input from several unit chiefs and incorporated their written suggestions. The publisher reviewed my entries last week and conducted its own reference checking.

All I am asking is that you skim or take a quick read through to see if there are any show stoppers ... anything that is glaringly incorrect. I know you are very busy w/other more important issues but would greatly appreciate 15 mins of your time. It is not required that I have the FDA entry reviewed, but my experience here at the FBI has taught me to make sure all my bases are covered. There is only one sentence in that entry that mentions the FBI ... page 6 paragraph 3. If you don't mind taking a look at that one paragraph please.

The following disclaimer will be included in my by-line:

"The views, opinions, and research herein represent the product of the author only."

The publisher sent me the pdfs as somewhat final drafts. I'd greatly appreciate it if you could get back to me w/any substantive comments by COB Wednesday, January 20. I caught a few grammatical mistakes in their editing but I'm just asking for substantive show stoppers from you.

To date, you [REDACTED] and RMD are the only individuals w/copies of the entries. If you intend to forward these drafts for any reason, I would appreciate your letting me know ... I would like very limited dissemination prior to publication.

b6 -2

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
 Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 4:42 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

I did misunderstand you earlier this morning when I came by your office. I thought you stated you looked at the document and that you had sent it to OGC for review as part of the pre-pub process. My misunderstanding led me to believe there is an entity in OGC that reviews personal publications and renders an opinion to RMD pre-pub. What I understand you are saying now is that OGC does not have a role since this is a personal publication and RMD conducts this pre-pub review process. I will follow up w/RMD.

Thanks,
 Serina

b6 -2

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 4:23 PM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

Per email below, OGC does NOT conduct a substantive legal review of personal publications. There is no OGC point of contact for this. Your POC is RMD, which is facilitating the prepublication review process.

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 4:21 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Vandegrift, Serina N. [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

Thank you [REDACTED] Unless I misunderstood you earlier today, OGC is conducting the substantive legal review. Are you able to provide me the OGC POC?
 Serina

b6 -2

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 8:24 AM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N. [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

Serina, per our discussion, I have already talked to [REDACTED] in connection with the official prepub review process. While OGC does substantive legal review and provides comments for official FBI products, it is really outside my lane to be doing legal editing for personal publications. I would suggest generally that you double check your citations and legal research though, as I'm sure you will do anyway in the final editing process with your publisher, assuming that the Bureau clears this through the prepub review. RMD should be getting back to you with the official Bureau comments. Thanks.

b6 -2

PREPUB-6104

1/19/2010

[REDACTED]

b6 -2

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 8:02 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

Thanks for the update [REDACTED]

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

ALL the information came from open source materials. The drafts I sent you earlier this morning have better citations for follow up. I look forward to OGC's comments, especially the CJIS issue considering I did not write anything that is not already public. Additionally, I have no problem removing my FBI affiliation in the by-line if that poses a problem or angst w/in the Bureau.

Thanks,
Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 7:25 AM
To: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

I had already sent it to [REDACTED] who is currently pushing it through the OGC channels. There are several issues with it already-but they will make a final report and recommendation then it will go to the front office for review because you cite your employment in your by-line. CJIS has several issues including one that they do not want made public. The review process is currently ongoing. /

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

b6 -2
b7E -4

From: Vandegrift, Serina N.
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 7:19 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] Vandegrift, Serina N.
Subject: FW: Encyclopedia on Bioterrorism Defense

b6 -2

[REDACTED]

b6 -2

In Spring 2009, I was asked to write the FDA and FBI entries for the 3rd edition to the *Encyclopedia of Bioterrorism Defense*. This project was not part of my FBI duties nor did I work on these writings while "on the job." However, b/c I am an FBI employee and am writing on FBI's activities, I have to get my entries reviewed. I contacted the RMD pre-pub unit to for guidance and the representative stated that I just needed my supervisor's approval. However, I think [] would feel more comfortable if I ran this by the 2 of you in your capacities as [] b6 -2

Everything I wrote is fact-based, not opinion. All the material was obtained from open sources and I have printed copies of my references. W/r/t the Lab Division, I received input from several unit chiefs and incorporated their written suggestions. The publisher reviewed my entries last week and conducted its own reference checking.

All I am asking is that you skim or take a quick read through to see if there are any show stoppers ... anything that is glaringly incorrect. I know you are very busy w/other more important issues but would greatly appreciate 15 mins of your time. It is not required that I have the FDA entry reviewed, but my experience here at the FBI has taught me to make sure all my bases are covered. There is only one sentence in that entry that mentions the FBI ... page 6 paragraph 3. If you don't mind taking a look at that one paragraph please.

The following disclaimer will be included in my by-line:

"The views, opinions, and research herein represent the product of the author only."

The publisher sent me the pdfs as somewhat final drafts. I'd greatly appreciate it if you could get back to me w/any substantive comments by COB Wednesday, January 20. I caught a few grammatical mistakes in their editing but I'm just asking for substantive show stoppers from you.

To date, you, [] and RMD are the only individuals w/copies of the entries. If you intend to forward these drafts for any reason, I would appreciate your letting me know ... I would like very limited dissemination prior to publication. b6 -2

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Serina

Serina N. Vandegrift, []

b6 -2
b7E -4